



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/716,531	09/19/96	MAHE	Y 016800-111

NORMAN H STEPNO  
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS  
PO BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1404

HM12/0511

EXAMINER

BURKE, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1642

20

DATE MAILED:

05/11/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Advisory Action**Application No.  
**08/716,531**Applicant(s)  
**Mahe et al**Examiner  
**Julie E. Burke, (Reeves), Ph.D.**Group Art Unit  
**1642**

THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☒ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on 8 Mar 1999 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on 8 Mar 1999 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☐ The proposed amendment(s):
- ☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
  - ☐ will not be entered because:
    - ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
    - ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
    - ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
    - ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

~~NOTE:~~ Final rejection set forth 12/7/98 was properly made because no new grounds of rejection were raised and because all claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office Action.

- ☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):  
none

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
the claims broadly recite the treatment of any type of inflammation and Oluyomi et al specifically teach that the peptide is "significantly active in the late phase after i.p. and p.o. administration" for antinociceptive (page 137, col 1) See "OJ 11/98"
- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
- Claims allowed: none
- Claims objected to: none
- Claims rejected: 1-11 and 16-19

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

- ☒ Other The claims have not been rejected under 102/103 by Hiltz et al (1989). Concerning the arguments about Ferreira et al, the claims are drawn to treating inflammation. The spec teaches "swelling, pain, redness and warmth are the terms which may be used to described localized inflammation" (p 1, lines 22-25). Thus Ferreira et al's pain treatment reads upon the broadly claimed anti-inflammatory treatment.

**PAULA K. HUTZELL**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**